

Bottcher, Helen

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2016 7:51 AM
To: wyckoffcomments
Subject: Fwd: Wyckoff/EagleHarbor Proposed Plan and Feasibility Study

Begin forwarded message:

From: (b) (6)
Subject: Wyckoff/EagleHarbor Proposed Plan and Feasibility Study
Date: June 28, 2016 at 7:08:45 AM PDT
To: <https://cumulis-epa.gov/super-cpad/cursites/csitinfo.cfm?id-1000612>

This project seems to go on for ever. When we came to the Island 18 years ago the project to clean up the Creosote site was in full swing.

There does not seem to be a definite answer to the cleanup even now. Admittedly the problem is a complex but 18 years and still no final solution.

Cost is always the bottom line. Of the Alternatives for the solution only one will really solve the problem. What it has always been.

Get rid of the contaminants.

Any partial solution will always have problems recurring in the future.

We live here, the EPA will be long gone when the next problem with Creosote arises.

The Alternative 7 "concrete fix" is not permanent. Certainly better than what we have now, but the best and supposedly final solution Alternative 6, burning off the creosote is still the only truly complete solution.

Or is it?

After all these attempts to steam off the creosote with failing seals, enclose it with metal walls which degrade, cover it with sand which shifts with the currents what is THE solution?

I suspect there isn't one unless we get rid of all the creosote which is on the point.

Can EPA bear the cost? We certainly must find 10%. But to me the vexing question is will we really be rid of the creosote EVER?

When we agree to your solution the EPA will be long gone when the next creosote contamination area appears and then the State of WA and Bainbridge Island will be left to solve the problem of creosote contamination the harbor and beaches once again.

So my vote is for Alternative 6. Get rid of the stuff, IF you can

Sincerely

(b) (6)

Bainbridge Island WA 98110